



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/781,329	02/13/2001	Koji Fukumoto	826.1675/JDH	9064

21171 7590 02/15/2007
STAAS & HALSEY LLP
SUITE 700
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

NASH, LASHANYA RENEE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2153

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	02/15/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/781,329	Applicant(s) FUKUMOTO ET AL.	
	Examiner LaShanya R. Nash	Art Unit 2153	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 January 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to an Amendment filed 10 January 2007. Claims 1,2, and 4-9 are presented for further consideration. Claims 1, and 4-9 are currently amended. Claim 3 is canceled.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10 January 2007 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, see Remarks, filed 13 November 2006, with respect to the rejections of claims 1,2, and 4-9 under 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new grounds of rejection is made in view of a newly found prior art reference Shaughnessy et al. (US Patent 5,928,325), as set forth in the Office action below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1,2 and 4-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gilbert (US Patent 6,529,942) and further in view of Shaughnessy et al. (US Patent 5,928,325).

Gilbert teaches an email system and method which allows the originating user to customize text for a specific recipient in a multiple recipient email system (i.e. broadcast), (abstract).

In reference to claim 1, Gilbert shows that the E-mail system with recipient-specific content system includes:

- A receiving device (i.e. receiver; Figure 1-receiver) receiving transmission information transmitted from a sender (Figure 1-sender) to a plurality of receivers, (column 3, line 24 to column 4, line 30) and
 - An emphasizing device (i.e. network computer of sender) emphasizing and highlighting (i.e. size, color, bold, italic, etc.; column 4, lines 54-67);
 - A storing device (i.e. memory; column 3, lines 34-41) storing information predetermined for respective receivers (i.e. identifier codes; column 6, lines 10-31; column 7, lines 8-24), wherein the information is designated

by the sender and different for respective receivers (e.g. John is identified with "a" and Fred identified with "b"; column 8, lines 1- 43; Figure 5);

- Different parts the transmission information for respective receivers (i.e. select users to receive modified email message; column 5, lines 5-26), and preparing E-mail information (i.e. embedding text format commands and identifier codes; column 8, lines 1-18) including all of the transmission information with the transmission information in which the different parts are for respective receiver (columns 5-7; Figure 5),
- A transmitting device transmitting the E-mail information including all of the transmission information to respective receivers (i.e. receiver sensitive formatting; Figure 6- Emails for John, Harry, Mary and Original Email), (column 8, line 44 to column 9, line 18).

Gilbert shows substantial features of the claimed invention. However, Gilbert does not teach a storing device storing, independent of receiving the transmission information, keyword information predetermined for each receiver and subsequently highlighting these keywords included in E-mails. Nonetheless this feature would have been an obvious modification to the system disclosed by Gilbert as evidenced by Shaughnessy.

In an analogous art, Shaughnessy discloses a system for modifying E-mail messages for respective recipients over the Internet (abstract). Shaughnessy further shows a storing device (i.e. rules memory; Figure 1-item 25) storing, independent of receiving the transmission information (i.e. predetermined action rules stored in rules memory by a system designer; column 5, lines 30-41; column 6, lines 30-35), keyword

Art Unit: 2153

information predetermined for respective receivers, wherein the keyword information is highlighting in E-mails for the receiver (i.e. based on identified recipient, the message is modified to select message portions containing keywords; column 4, line 66-column 5, line 6; column 5, lines 42-55). Given this feature a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the advantages of modifying the recipient-specific E-mail system disclosed by Gilbert in order to dynamically examine and efficiently modify email content based on keywords intended for recipients having multiple devices, thereby increasing ease of use (Shaughnessy; column 3, lines 20-47).

In reference to claim 2, Gilbert shows receiving device that receives a part of the transmission information that the sender designates and information about a corresponding transmission destination and emphasizing device that emphasizes and highlights the designated part and prepares E-mail information for a receiver corresponding to the transmission destination, (columns 5-6).

In reference to claim 4, Gilbert shows a terminal apparatus (Figure 1-sender) comprising:

- Transmitting device transmitting transmission information prepared for a plurality of receivers (i.e. via network connection; column 3, lines 58 to column 4, line 16) including all of the transmission information and information predetermined for respective receivers (i.e. identifier codes; column 6, lines 10-31; column 7, lines 8-24), wherein the information is

designated by the sender and different for respective receivers (e.g. John is identified with "a" and Fred identified with "b"; column 8, lines 1- 43; Figure 5); and

- An indication device (i.e. software program executing on networked computer of sender; column 4, line 30 to column 5, line 5) indicating E-mail information that emphasizes and highlights different parts of the transmission information for respective receivers; preparing E-mail information for respective receivers including all of the transmission information (columns 6-7); and
- Transmitting the E-mail information for respective receivers, with all of the transmission information sent to all respective receivers (i.e. receiver sensitive formatting; Figure 6- Emails for John, Harry, Mary and Original Email), (column 5; columns 8-9).

Gilbert shows substantial features of the claimed invention. However, Gilbert does not teach a storing device storing, independent of receiving the transmission information, keyword information predetermined for each receiver and subsequently highlighting these keywords included in E-mails. Nonetheless this feature would have been an obvious modification to the system disclosed by Gilbert, as evidenced by Shaughnessy.

In an analogous art, Shaughnessy discloses a system for modifying E-mail messages for respective recipients over the Internet (abstract). Shaughnessy further shows a storing device (i.e. rules memory; Figure 1-item 25) storing, independent of receiving the transmission information (i.e. predetermined action rules stored in rules

Art Unit: 2153

memory by a system designer; column 5, lines 30-41; column 6, lines 30-35), keyword information predetermined for respective receivers, wherein the keyword information is highlighting in E-mails for the receiver (i.e. based on identified recipient, the message is modified to select message portions containing keywords; column 4, line 66-column 5, line 6; column 5, lines 42-55). Given this feature a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the advantages of modifying the recipient-specific E-mail system disclosed by Gilbert, in order to dynamically examine and efficiently modify email content based on keywords intended for recipients having multiple devices, thereby increasing ease of use (Shaughnessy; column 3, lines 20-47).

In reference to claim 5, Gilbert discloses developed software program including instructions to carry out the recipient specific email methods on computing systems (column 4, lines 16-67). As applied to previous claims, functions of the electronic mail system, as shown by Gilbert, include: receiving transmission information from a sender to a plurality of receivers; emphasizing and highlighting the different parts of transmission information for each receiver; preparing E-mail information for respective receivers; and transmitting the E-mail information for respective receivers. Therefore, Gilbert teaches a system comprising executable code that specifically implements the previously stated functions. This is equivalent to the software program disclosed by the applicant.

Gilbert shows substantial features of the claimed invention. However, Gilbert does not teach information independent of receiving the transmission information, predetermined

Art Unit: 2153

for respective receivers and subsequently emphasizing this information in E-mails.

Nonetheless this feature would have been an obvious modification to the method disclosed by Gilbert as evidenced by Shaughnessy.

In an analogous art, Shaughnessy discloses a method for modifying E-mail messages for respective recipients over the Internet (abstract). Shaughnessy further shows a storing device (i.e. rules memory; Figure 1-item 25) storing, independent of receiving the transmission information (i.e. predetermined action rules stored in rules memory by a system designer; column 5, lines 30-41; column 6, lines 30-35), keyword information predetermined for respective receivers, wherein the keyword information is highlighting in E-mails for the receiver (i.e. based on identified recipient, the message is modified to select message portions containing keywords; column 4, line 66-column 5, line 6; column 5, lines 42-55). Given this feature a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the advantages of modifying the recipient-specific E-mail method disclosed by Gilbert, in order to dynamically examine and efficiently modify email content based on keywords intended for recipients having multiple devices, thereby increasing ease of use (Shaughnessy; column 3, lines 20-47).

In reference to claim 6, Gilbert shows a method (Figures 2&4; columns 4-7) comprising:

- Preparing transmission information to be transmitted from a sender to a plurality of receivers (Figure 2-item 60); and

- Emphasizing and highlighting the transmission information for respective receivers (Figure 2-items 64-68);
- Preparing E-mail information for respective receivers, (Figure 2-item 72);
- Transmitting the E-mail information including all of the transmission information to all respective receivers, (Figure 2-item 73);
- Emphasizing and displaying the transmission information for respective receivers, (Figure 2-item 76; Figure 4a; Figure 6; column 8).

Gilbert shows substantial features of the claimed invention. However, Gilbert does not teach information independent of receiving the transmission information, predetermined for respective receivers and subsequently emphasizing this information in E-mails. Nonetheless this feature would have been an obvious modification to the method disclosed by Gilbert as evidenced by Shaughnessy.

In an analogous art, Shaughnessy discloses a method for modifying E-mail messages for respective recipients over the Internet (abstract). Shaughnessy further shows a storing device (i.e. rules memory; Figure 1-item 25) storing, independent of receiving the transmission information (i.e. predetermined action rules stored in rules memory by a system designer; column 5, lines 30-41; column 6, lines 30-35), keyword information predetermined for respective receivers, wherein the keyword information is highlighting in E-mails for the receiver (i.e. based on identified recipient, the message is modified to select message portions containing keywords; column 4, line 66-column 5, line 6; column 5, lines 42-55). Given this feature a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the advantages of modifying the

Art Unit: 2153

recipient-specific E-mail method disclosed by Gilbert, in order to dynamically examine and efficiently modify email content based on keywords intended for recipients having multiple devices, thereby increasing ease of use (Shaughnessy; column 3, lines 20-47).

In reference to claim 7, Gilbert explicitly discloses an E-mail system (Figure 1), comprising:

- Receiving means (Figure 1-receiver) for receiving transmission information transmitted from a sender (Figure 1-sender) to a plurality of receivers, transmitting means for transmitting the E-mail information for each receiver (column 3, line 24 to column 4, line 30); and
- Emphasizing means (i.e. network computer of sender) for emphasizing and highlighting (i.e. size, color, bold, italic, etc.; column 4, lines 54-67) the transmission information for respective receivers (i.e. select users to receive modified email message; column 5, lines 5-26), and preparing the email (i.e. embedding text format commands) for respective receiver (columns 5-7),
- Transmitting the E-mail information including all of the transmission information to all respective receivers (i.e. receiver sensitive formatting; Figure 6- Emails for John, Harry, Mary and Original Email), (column 5; columns 8-9).

Gilbert shows substantial features of the claimed invention. However, Gilbert does not teach information independent of receiving the transmission information, predetermined

Art Unit: 2153

for respective receivers and subsequently emphasizing this information in E-mails.

Nonetheless this feature would have been an obvious modification to the system disclosed by Gilbert as evidenced by Shaughnessy.

In an analogous art, Shaughnessy discloses a system for modifying E-mail messages for respective recipients over the Internet (abstract). Shaughnessy further shows a storing device (i.e. rules memory; Figure 1-item 25) storing, independent of receiving the transmission information (i.e. predetermined action rules stored in rules memory by a system designer; column 5, lines 30-41; column 6, lines 30-35), keyword information predetermined for respective receivers, wherein the keyword information is highlighting in E-mails for the receiver (i.e. based on identified recipient, the message is modified to select message portions containing keywords; column 4, line 66-column 5, line 6; column 5, lines 42-55). Given this feature a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the advantages of modifying the recipient-specific E-mail system disclosed by Gilbert, in order to dynamically examine and efficiently modify email content based on keywords intended for recipients having multiple devices, thereby increasing ease of use (Shaughnessy; column 3, lines 20-47).

In reference to claim 8, Gilbert discloses the E-mail system with recipient-specific content system includes:

- A system (Figure 1) for propagating a signal from a propagating computer (i.e. Figure 1-sender) to receiver computers (i.e. Figure 1-receiver), (i.e.

via network; Figure 1-item 10) the propagating computer of the system comprising a program (i.e. software program; column 4, lines 30-67),

As applied to previous claims, functions of the electronic mail system, as shown by Gilbert, include: receiving transmission information from a sender to a plurality of receivers; emphasizing and highlighting the different parts of transmission information for each receiver; preparing E-mail information for respective receivers; and transmitting the E-mail information including all of the transmission information to respective receivers.

Gilbert shows substantial features of the claimed invention. However, Gilbert does not teach information independent of receiving the transmission information, predetermined for respective receivers and subsequently emphasizing this information in E-mails. Nonetheless this feature would have been an obvious modification to the system disclosed by Gilbert as evidenced by Shaughnessy.

In an analogous art, Shaughnessy discloses a system for modifying E-mail messages for respective recipients over the Internet (abstract). Shaughnessy further shows a storing device (i.e. rules memory; Figure 1-item 25) storing, independent of receiving the transmission information (i.e. predetermined action rules stored in rules memory by a system designer; column 5, lines 30-41; column 6, lines 30-35), keyword information predetermined for respective receivers, wherein the keyword information is highlighting in E-mails for the receiver (i.e. based on identified recipient, the message is modified to select message portions containing keywords; column 4, line 66-column 5, line 6; column 5, lines 42-55). Given this feature a person of ordinary skill in the art at

Art Unit: 2153

the time of the invention would have readily recognized the advantages of modifying the recipient-specific E-mail system disclosed by Gilbert, in order to dynamically examine and efficiently modify email content based on keywords intended for recipients having multiple devices, thereby increasing ease of use (Shaughnessy; column 3, lines 20-47).

In reference to claim 9, Gilbert explicitly discloses a method (Figures 2&4; columns 4-7) for recipient-specific content emailing. Gilbert discloses the method to comprise:

- Receiving information for different destinations with the information having different parts (Figure 2-items 60-64);
- Emphasizing the different parts responsive to the destinations (Figure 2-item 68-72; Figure 3);
- Sending all of the information by email to all the destinations with each destination receiving all of the information, to with at least one of the parts emphasized responsive to the destination (Figure 2-item 73); and
- Displaying the information with one of the parts emphasized at least one of the destinations, (Figure 2-item 76; Figure 4a; Figure 6; column 8).

Gilbert shows substantial features of the claimed invention. However, Gilbert does not teach information independent of receiving the transmission information, predetermined for respective receivers and subsequently emphasizing this information in E-mails.

Nonetheless this feature would have been an obvious modification to the method disclosed by Gilbert as evidenced by Shaughnessy.

Art Unit: 2153

In an analogous art, Shaughnessy discloses a method for modifying E-mail messages for respective recipients over the Internet (abstract). Shaughnessy further shows a storing device (i.e. rules memory; Figure 1-item 25) storing, independent of receiving the transmission information (i.e. predetermined action rules stored in rules memory by a system designer; column 5, lines 30-41; column 6, lines 30-35), keyword information predetermined for respective receivers, wherein the keyword information is highlighting in E-mails for the receiver (i.e. based on identified recipient, the message is modified to select message portions containing keywords; column 4, line 66-column 5, line 6; column 5, lines 42-55). Given this feature a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the advantages of modifying the recipient-specific E-mail method disclosed by Gilbert, in order to dynamically examine and efficiently modify email content based on keywords intended for recipients having multiple devices, thereby increasing ease of use (Shaughnessy; column 3, lines 20-47).


Conclusion


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LaShanya R Nash whose telephone number is (571) 272-3957. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton Burgess can be reached on (571) 272-3949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Art Unit: 2153

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LaShanya Nash 
Art Unit, 2153
February 8, 2007


RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER